



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/265,489	03/09/1999	SASHIKANTH CHANDRASEKARAN	237/116	4574

23639 7590 03/31/2003

BINGHAM, MCCUTCHEN LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO, SUITE 1800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4067

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TAM V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/265,489

Applicant(s)

CHANDRASEKARAN ET AL.

Examiner

Tam V Nguyen

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 23-26 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6. 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2172

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are pending in this action. Claims 1-27 are presented for examination.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 23-26 have been allowed in the previous office action.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The references cited in the IDS, Pto-1449, Paper No. 6, have been considered.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12, the amended of claims 13, 21, and the added of new claim 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (Lonnie E. Moseley).

Re claim 1, Moseley discloses providing said data of an information record to a consumer, (fig. 33.1 is a table contains plurality of records, pages 757); and updating a

Art Unit: 2172

history table, (fig. 33.1 allows the user or consumer to delete and to sort the records file, pages 757).

Moseley discloses history table, (fig. 33.1), but Moseley does not clearly disclose comprising a message state field, said updating comprising setting said message state field in a history record corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data. However, Moseley discloses an inbox, which allow the users to view the contents of the inbox folder. When the users want to read an e-mail message, the users just double-click on it to open the message to read its full content. The envelopes opened indicate the record has been read, and the envelopes closed indicate the record has not been read, (see fig. 33.1). Thus, Moseley teaches said message state field in history record corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the taught, so the users know which message that the users have been read and which message that users have not been read. In this way, it save the users or consumers a lot of time.

Re claim 6, Moseley discloses storing data to be accessed by a consumer in an information record, (see fig. 33.1, pages 757); creating a history record for each consumer that is to access said data, (see fig. 33.1 is a history table contains plurality of records); and setting said message state field in each said history record to indicate said data has not been accessed, (fig. 33.1, the envelopes closed indicate the record has not bee read, pages 757).

Re claim 8, Moseley discloses reading one or more history records of said history table, said one or more history records comprising a history table read, (see fig. 33.1, pages 757); and deleting an information record if all the message state fields in all of the history records of said history table read indicate that said data in said information record has been accessed, (fig. 33.1, the envelopes opened indicate the record has been read, pager 757).

7. Claims 2-5, 7, and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (Lonnie E. Moseley) in view of Itakura et al. (US 6351745B1).

Re claim 2, Moseley does not disclose, "Which each of the information record further comprises a message identifier value that identifies the data of said information record and each said history record further comprises a message id field that identifies data in an information record."

However, Itakura teaches each of the information record further comprises a message identifier value, (fig. 7, Message User ID) that identifies the data of said information record and each of history record (fig. 7 is a history table contains plurality of records) further comprises a message id field that identifies data in an information record, (fig. 7, Message User ID), (col. 9, line 55-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Moseley with the teaching of

Art Unit: 2172

Itakura, so when a user requests a message, the user's characteristics are read out from the user database based on a user ID for identifying the user, (col. 3, lines 39-41).

Re claim 3, Moseley discloses in which each of the history record, (see fig. 33.1, pages 757). But Moseley does not teach, comprises a consumer id field that identifies a consumer of said multiple consumers that is to access data in an information record, said data identified by said message id field in said history record, said consumer id field of said history record identifying said history record as corresponding to said consumer.

However, Itakura also teaches which each of history record (fig. 7 is a history table contains plurality of record) further comprises a consumer id field (fig. 7, Item Provider ID) that identifies a consumer of said multiple consumers (fig. 7, Items XXX, AAA, and OOO) that is to access data in an information record, said data identified by said message id field (fig. 9, Message URL) in said history record, said consumer id field of said history record identifying said history record as corresponding to said consumer, (col. 9, lines 55-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Moseley with the teaching of Itakura, so when a user requests a message, the user's characteristics are read out from the user database based on a user ID for identifying the user, (col. 3, lines 39-41).

Art Unit: 2172

Re claim 4, Moseley discloses in which said updating comprises setting said message state field in the history record (see fig. 33.1 is a history table, pages 757). But Moseley does not disclose a message id field that identifies said data that said consumer is provider access to and with a consumer id field that identifies said consumer.

However, Itakura teaches a message id field (fig. 9, Message URL is a message id field) that identifies said data that said consumer is provider access to and with a consumer id field (fig. 7, Message User ID) that identifies said consumer, (col. 10, lines 22-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Moseley with the teaching of Itakura, so when a user requests a message, the user's characteristics are read out from the user database based on a user ID for identifying the user. Then, a message ID is searched from the transmittal condition database based on the user's characteristic read out from the user database. The messages found by the message searcher are read out from the message, and transmitted to the user's terminal, (col. 3, lines 39-45).

Re claim 5, Moseley discloses which said history table comprises a history record for each consumer, for each information record comprising data to be provided to each said consumer, (see fig. 33.1, pages 757) But Moseley does not disclose in which prefix index key compression is used to store only one instance of a message identifier

value that identifies the data of an information record in said history table for each history record for said information record.

However, Itakura teaches in which prefix index key compression is used to store only one instance of a message identifier (fig. 9, MESSAGE URL) value that identifies the data of an information record in said history table for each history record for said information record, (col. 10, lines 21-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Moseley with the teaching of Itakura, so it is easy for identifying a message based on those user characteristics, (col. 5, lines 48-49).

Re claim 7, Moseley does not disclose, "Comprising a read-order table, said read-order table comprising order data that indicates the relative order that data in said information records is to be accessed by said multiple consumers, said method further comprising identifying the data of an information record that a consumer is to be provided access to by said order data in said read-order table."

However, Itakura teaches comprising a read-order table, said read-order table comprising order data that indicates the relative order that data in said information records is to be accessed by said multiple consumers, said method further comprising identifying the data of an information record that a consumer is to be provided access to by said order data in said read-order table, (col. 18, lines 21-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Moseley with the teaching of Itakura, so the information is reliably transmitted to every user at least once without fail.

Re claim 9, Moseley discloses a work list table, said work list table comprising one or more work entries (see fig. 33.1, the history table contains a plurality of entries). But Moseley does not disclose each said work entry comprising an identification of data in an information record.

However, Itakura teaches each said work entry comprising an identification of data in an information record, (fig. 11, col. 10, lines 59-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Moseley with the teaching of Itakura because the users who utilize Internet have become a highly diverse group of consumers.

Re claim 10, Moseley does not disclose, "Adding a work entry to said work list table, said work entry comprising an identification of said consumer is provided access to."

However, Itakura teaches adding a work entry to said work list table, said work entry comprising an identification of said consumer is provided access to, (col. 18, lines 34-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Moseley with the teaching of Itakura, so the system prevents messages from being transmitted to terminals in vain when the user is not actively recognizing the message.

Re claims 11 and 12, recite similar limitations as discussed in claim 1.
Therefore, claim 11 and 12 are also rejected for the same reason as given in claim 1.

8. Claims 13-20, 21-22, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandra et al. (US 6058389) in view of Itakura et al. (US 6351745B1).

Re claim 13, Chandra discloses an information queue (fig. 2 is information queue) comprising one or more information queue records (fig. 2 shows queue 1 and queue 2 records), each said information queue record comprising information to be accessed by one or more consumer, (col. 7, lines 6-8, each row contains columns that store the message identifier, queue name, queue schema, time in seconds, and a flag indicating whether the time is a delay time or expiration time).

Chandra discloses each said table record comprising an identification of said information in an information queue record, (col. 8, lines 63-66). However, Chandra does not disclose a table separated from said information queue comprising one or

Art Unit: 2172

more table records, each said table record further comprising a consumer identification field comprising an identification of one of said one or more consumer.

However, Itakura teaches a table (fig. 7) separated from said information queue comprising one or more table records (fig. 7, the table contains plurality of records, items XXX, AAA, AND OOO), each said table record further comprising a consumer identification field (fig. 7, MESSAGE USER PASSWORD field) comprising an identification of one of said one or more consumer (fig. 7, the ID and password of each message user).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Chandra with the teaching of Itakura because when a user requests a message, the user's characteristics are read out from the user database based on a user ID for identifying the user. In this way, the user accesses a message more accurately.

Re claim 14, Chandra further discloses in which each said information queue record further comprises said identification of said information of said information queue record, (col. 8, lines 63-66).

Re claim 15, Chandra further discloses in which each said table record further comprises a message state field that indicates if the information in said information queue identified in the corresponding information identification field of said table record

has been delivered to the consumer identified in the consumer identification field of said table record, (col. 8, lines 63-66).

Re claim 16, Chandra further discloses a read-order table, said read-order table comprising order data indicating the order that information in said information queue is to be delivered to a consumer, (col. 16, lines 53-55).

Re claim 17, Chandra further discloses in which said read-order table comprises one or more records, each said record of said read-order table comprising an identification field that identifies information in a information queue record (col. 16, lines 53-55), each said record of said read-order table further comprising an enqueue time field that comprises said order data, (col. 16, lines 40-43).

Re claim 18, Chandra further discloses comprising a work list table (fig. 4B), said work list table comprising one or more work list entries (fig. 4B contains plurality of records), each said work list entry comprising an identification of information in an information queue record, (col. 10, lines 52-59).

Re claim 19, Chandra further discloses in which each said work list entry is a record, (col. 10, lines 46-59).

Re claim 20, Chandra further discloses in which said work list table comprises one or more work records and each said work list entry is a field in a work record, (col. 10, lines 46-59).

Re claim 21, Chandra discloses a message queue, (col. 7, lines 7-8) comprising one or more message queue record (col. 7, lines 4-14), each said one or more message queue records comprising a message and a message identification, (col. 8, lines 63-66). Chandra discloses each of said one or more history records comprising a message identification (col. 8, lines 63-66), a consumer identification (col. 7, lines 39-40) and a message state identification, (col. 8, lines 63-66, flag indicating whether the time is delay time or expiration time); and one or more work list entries, (col. 10, lines 52-58), each work list entry comprising a message identification, (col. 8, lines 63-66). But Chandra does not teach a history table separated from said message queue and a work list table separated from said message queue and said history table.

However, Itakura teaches a history table separated from said message queue (fig. 7) and a work list table (fig. 7 also a work list table) separated from said message queue and said history table, (col. 9, lines 55-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Chandra with the teaching of Itakura so the message providers know the characteristics of the user, such as sex, age, etc.

Art Unit: 2172

Re claim 22, Chandra further discloses a read-order table comprising one or more read-order records, each said read-order record (col. 10, lines 52-57) comprising a message identification (col. 8, lines 63-66) and order data, said order data indicating the relative order that the message of said message queue that is identified by the message identification of said read-order record is to be delivered to a consumer, (col. 10, lines 46-59).

Re claim 27, recite similar limitation as discussed in claim 13. Therefore, claim 27 is also rejected for the same reasons as given in claim 13.

Contact Information

9. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

10. **Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam V Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-5: 00PM.**


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Yen Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for formal communications and (703) 746-7240 for informal communications.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia 22202. Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

11. **Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.**

TV:tv

03/21/03


SHAHID AL ALAM
PATENT EXAMINER